

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

MATHEW COLLETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

MASON COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-CV-5654-TMC-DWC

ORDER GRANTING COUNTY  
DEFENDANTS LEAVE TO RESPOND

The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to United States Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. This matter is before the Court on its inherent power to manage proceedings “so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc.*, 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991)).

The defendants in this case are organized into two groups with each group represented by different counsel. The first is comprised of individuals employed by Mason County and the county itself (hereinafter “County Defendants”). The second includes a private food service

1 provider and vendor known as Summit Foods and the company's head cook assigned to Mason  
2 County Jail (hereinafter "SJS Defendants").

3 On January 5, 2024, SJS Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 87.  
4 Upon review, it appears SJS Defendants take a position in their motion that is potentially averse  
5 to County Defendants. More specifically, SJS Defendants argue the County is responsible for  
6 making all relevant decisions regarding religious meal accommodations. *Id.* at 2–4. The time for  
7 responding to the summary judgment motion has now passed with no response filed by County  
8 Defendants.

9 Without a response from County Defendants, the Court is unable to discern whether they  
10 agree with SJS Defendants' representation about the relative responsibilities of Mason County  
11 and Summit Foods. Therefore, to ensure all parties have ample opportunity to develop the record  
12 on this point, the Court grants County Defendants leave to respond, either in opposition or in  
13 support, to SJS Defendants' motion for summary judgment.<sup>1</sup> If they so desire, County  
14 Defendants must respond to the motion by February 12, 2024. The reply from SJS Defendants on  
15 its summary judgment motion (including argument regarding any response filed by County  
16 Defendants) is extended to February 16, 2024. The Clerk is directed to re-note the summary  
17 judgment motion (Dkt. 87) for consideration on February 16, 2024.

18 Dated this 31st day of January, 2024.

19 

20 David W. Christel  
21 Chief United States Magistrate Judge

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has already responded in opposition to SJS Defendant's motion for summary judgment. Dkts. 92,  
93. As such, nothing in this order should be read as granting him leave to file further responses to that motion.